

The EUROPEAN

and prompted the restraint. And private profit was, at best, a by-product in the productive process.

Syndical Socialism seems, in this respect, to attempt a synthesis of opposites. In doing so it accepts the principle of private profit, and yet entertains state interference to ensure collective well-being. An industrial syndicate, as long as its accepted motive is profit maximization, finds itself constantly hampered by state regulation. State initiative becomes interference and restraint becomes oppressive. Such a conflict of principle with practice can only lead to continual friction between the industrial workers' combines, private enterprises and the state.

And yet while all this can, and perhaps must, be said of Syndical Socialism its tremendous value must not, as a consequence, be obscured. It is the only contemporary political concept which deals with the complex problems which afflict our world—and if occasionally a plume from the exotic costume of a Proudhon, or a Bakunin, or a Kropotkin should make its appearance in the accoutrements of what maintains itself to be a modern doctrine—we can be indulgent. For whatever its shortcomings modern British syndicalism keeps alive a tradition of revolution in an age of conformity, and in a time that has turned its back upon history, British syndicalism reaffirms a faith in the men, the accomplishments and the institutions of Europe.

Tomorrow we shall be the heirs of the chaos which, even today, lies heavy in the womb of the West. Syndicalism, which in the past has offered Europe greatness, may well, once again, offer it sanctuary, succour and a future.

EVOLUTION AND THE MODERN STATE

by ROGER PEARSON M.Sc (Econ).

SOME MONTHS AGO I was browsing through *Essays on Human Evolution** by the eminent British anthropologist, Sir Arthur Keith, and I was interested to find therein a plainly spoken analysis of the pre-war German eugenic policy. Sir Arthur Keith's observations, which many will see as a defence of Hitlerite philosophy, are of great importance, coming as they do from an Englishman, who is perhaps the world's leading authority on evolution.

Sir Arthur holds the opinion that amongst the higher forms of animal life evolution takes place not as a struggle of individual against individual, but as the war of tribe against tribe and nation against nation. It is the co-operation of individuals, each belonging to larger, competing units, that is the basic achievement of higher life, and it is by competitive selection between different tribes or races that evolution largely proceeds.

Again, from the point of view and for the necessary purpose of evolution a tribe or nation is not merely a collection of individuals, but a corporate body which, to quote Sir Arthur, "nature has entrusted with an assortment of human seed or genes, the assortment differing in some degree from that entrusted to any other tribe. If the genes are to work out their evolutionary effect, then it is necessary that the tribe or corporation should maintain its integrity through an infinity of generations." Variations in the genes occur from time to time as a result of

* Watts & Co., 1946.

"mutations" created by nature, and the popular idea that a mingling of distinct races is necessary to ensure change or progress is, in the truest meaning of the word, nonsense. The effect of a mingling of races is to interfere with the work of evolution, by destroying the pattern of mutations before the process can reach maturity. "If a tribe loses its integrity", Sir Arthur shows, "by a slackening of the social code, by a lack of courage or skill to defend itself from the aggression of neighbouring tribes, or by free interbreeding with its neighbours and thus scattering its genes, then that tribe as an evolutionary venture has come to an untimely end." If a nation with a more advanced or superior set of genes mingles with—instead of ignoring or destroying—an inferior tribe, then it commits national suicide, and destroys the work of thousands of years of isolation and natural selection.

Viewed from the standpoint of these convictions, Sir Arthur, as an anthropologist, declares that Adolf Hitler was an evolutionist in both theory and practice. In short, for the National Socialists the "national" frontier of Europe was also the "evolutionary" frontier, and the Fuehrer gave the idea of the "nation" or "tribe" an almost religious sanctity, declaring: "it is not for men to discuss the question why Providence created different races, but rather to recognise that it punishes those who disregard its work of creation". As Sir Arthur Keith observes, "the German Fuehrer, like Bishop Barnes and many of our more intellectual clergy, regards evolution as God's mode of creation". Such an attitude is, indeed, the only way in which a belief in Christianity can be reconciled with the findings of science. With this Sir Arthur evidently concurs, for he adds, "here we have expounded the perfectly sound doctrine of evolutionary isolation (the voluntary or enforced avoidance of cross-marriage)", and also that, "Sir Francis Galton, the founder of eugenics, taught a somewhat similar evolutionary doctrine".

Whether or not we agree with this "religious" acceptance of the laws of evolution—and the idea that the purpose or intention of an unknown Providence must be blindly accepted with it—we cannot but accept the reality of the laws themselves. By them nature has raised the anthropoids far above the simple organic states from which life first sprang; and now that human science has unveiled so many of these laws it would be ludicrous if we were to choose consciously to ignore the use of such

knowledge. We cannot afford to disregard the natural laws which govern our very character in favour of the whims and fancies of passing generations. Nature, as Sir Arthur points out, has endowed us with an inherent fear of incest in order to ensure that the social and tribal circle is large enough to provide for a wider mental life and for a greater degree of social organisation. But at the same time nature has also endowed us with an inherent fear of tribes which differ from our own in shape or colour, which is intended, under natural conditions, to prevent a loss of genetic homogeneity should two widely different tribes chance to come into geographical proximity. In a civilised state we often endeavour to train ourselves to overcome such "prejudice", but tribalism is inborn in us for good reason, for when tribal antipathies die the species becomes mongrelised, the pattern of genes is lost, and the work of evolution is destroyed. Promising species are annihilated, while the product of harmful mutations survives, instead of meeting the natural death which competition, instead of assimilation, would have brought it.

In order, therefore, to adhere to the laws of evolution, the German National Socialists fanned the rational appreciation of race and evolution in Germany. The national or tribal spirit was stirred, unity of spirit and unity of purpose were encouraged as the ONLY way to survival in a world which, distorted by man's imperfect attempts at civilised life, is yet, and will always be, subject to the physical laws of nature. No German was to be guilty of introducing or spreading hybridity, imperfect stock within the nation was to be discouraged from reproduction, and those who were fit were to endeavour to raise the birth rate, in order that the German nation might grow in numbers and strength in competition with the ever increasing millions who pressed upon the borders of Europe.

Only in the attitude of the National Socialists to the Jews does Sir Arthur Keith suggest that their policy might have been at variance with the purpose of evolution. Hitler saw in the Jews a constant threat of intermarriage—a source of alien blood which in the course of time might well lead to the mongrelisation of the German people. The cruel policy of Hitler towards the Jews, Sir Arthur concedes, cannot "be explained by attributing to it a mere satisfaction of a lust, or a search for a scapegoat on which Germany can wreak her wrath from the ills which followed her defeat in 1918. The Church in Spain subjected the Jews to

the cruelty of the Inquisition, but no one ever sought to explain the Church's behaviour by suggesting that she had a lust for cruelty that had to be satisfied." But where Sir Arthur does find fault with the National Socialist persecution of the Jews, (beyond, of course, abhorring the brutalities that accompanied the "tribal" war) is in his claim that the Jews, like the pre-war Germans, also believed in racial purity: "for two thousand years," he writes, "living amid European communities, they (the Jews) have maintained their identity; it is an article of their creed, as it is of Hitler's, to breed true. They, too, practise an evolutionary doctrine." Such an opinion must clearly stand or fall with the truth of his claim that the Jews breed true; there can be no doubt that the Orthodox Jew does so, but Louis Wirth, in *The Ghetto*, shows that in modern times there is a strong tendency for the Western Jew to endeavour to break away from his own community and to attempt to lose his identity and mingle freely with the Gentiles.

Sir Arthur's opinions should stimulate considerable thought in the minds of his readers, at a time when immigration into the British Isles has reached unprecedented numbers, and the ever increasing percentage of Asiatic and African blood in our cities is threatening to contaminate the entire population. While the best of the nation are selectively destroyed by warfare, their places at home are taken by an entirely alien species, and the stock of the men of Agincourt, Trafalgar, Waterloo and Arnhem is brought rapidly nearer extinction. Another evolutionary experiment is on its way to an untimely end.

Men and Books III

by DESMOND STEWART

THE FIRST VOLUME of Steven Runciman's *History of the Crusades** came out five years ago, but I have been reading it this winter in my garden. I mention my garden, because it is in Baghdad, and being in the east, one can read things years late with no sense of guilt at not being up to the moment. The book tells, with a simplicity of narrative to shame any suspense-making detective, the tale of the Crusades—a word with associations going back to the nursery, the pulpit, the schoolroom, the cinema, the Mediterranean holiday, the visit to the museum.

Baghdad is a good place in which to read about the Crusades. Although it was beyond the reach of the Franks, the caliphal city must have come into their dreams. Indeed, I remember hearing that the Hertfordshire town of Baldock, now famous for women's stockings, was named so by a House of Knights Templar there resident. Returned from the Crusades without having taken Baghdad, they christened their village Baldock. (This story depends on the notion that the Italian name for Baghdad was Baldocco. On modern Italian maps it is spelt as I spell it, but without the "h", which shows that the third sound in the name is not an English g, but a Parisian "r".)

Perhaps because Baghdad was never invaded by barbarians carrying crosses and vindictive swords, its people lack the craft and hostility of the Arabs of the Mediterranean seaboard. Neither could the Iraqis ever be described as fanatical. On the other hand, the only word for the Crusaders is "barbarian". Everywhere they went, they slaughtered, whether Jews, Moslems or Christians of the eastern church. And when at last they took

* Cambridge, 1951